

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6                   **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
7                   **DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

8  
9 NATHAN WILLIAMS,

10                  Petitioner,   3:17-cv-00365-HDM-WGC

11 vs.

12 JOE GENTRY, *et al.*,

13                  Respondents.

14   **ORDER**

15  
16         In this habeas corpus action, brought *pro se*, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254, by  
17 Nathan Williams, a Nevada prisoner, the reespondents filed a motion to dismiss on October 3, 2017  
18 (ECF No. 9). Respondents filed exhibits in support of the motion to dismiss (ECF Nos. 10, 11 and  
19 12). Williams' response to the motion to dismiss is due on December 4, 2017. *See* Order entered  
20 August 1, 2017 (ECF No. 5); Order entered October 12, 2017 (ECF No. 13).

21         On October 26, 2017, Williams filed a request that the Clerk of the Court send him copies of  
22 certain exhibits -- an Exhibit 94, and two others, apparently -- that he felt respondents had failed to  
23 serve upon him (ECF No. 14). The Court denied that request on October 30, 2017 (ECF No. 15),  
24 determining that, as no such exhibits had been filed by respondents, there had been no failure to  
25 serve such exhibits on Williams.

26

1 On November 15, 2017, Williams filed a Motion for Production of Documents (ECF No. 16),  
2 again concerning the exhibits that he believes he is missing. In this motion, Williams requests that  
3 respondents be ordered to produce the following three documents:

- “Exhibit 94; Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus (Post-Conviction), filed 8/16/16, Nevada Supreme Court, Case No. 71033;”
  - “Order Denying Petition, Filed 10/13/16, Nevada Supreme Court, Case No. 71033 (Exhibit 95);” and
  - “Exhibit 96; Notice in Lieu of Remittitur, Filed 11/07/16, Nevada Supreme Court Case No. 71033.”

9 | Motion for Production of Documents (ECF No. 16), p. 1.

10 The Court will require respondents to respond to Williams' motion for production of  
11 documents, and will suspend Williams' response to the motion to dismiss pending resolution of that  
12 motion.

13       **IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED** that respondents shall, within 20 days from the date of  
14 this order, respond to petitioner's Motion for Production of Documents (ECF No. 16). Thereafter,  
15 petitioner will have 20 days to file a reply.

16       **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that petitioner's response to respondents' motion to dismiss  
17 (ECF No. 9) is suspended. The Court will set a new deadline for petitioner's response to that motion  
18 after the motion for production of documents is resolved.

19 || Dated this 16<sup>th</sup> day of November, 2017.

Howard D McRabb

---

## UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE